arXiv:1508.05835v2 [math.PR] 6 Jun 2016

`AV2b.tex`

An HJB Approach to a General Continuous-Time Mean-Variance Stochastic Control Problem [*]

G. Aivaliotis[†] & A. Yu. Veretennikov[‡]

June 7, 2016

Abstract

A general continuous mean-variance problem is considered where the cost functional has an integral and a terminal-time component. The problem is transformed into a superposition of a static and a dynamic optimization problems. The value function of the latter can be considered as the solution to a degenerate HJB equation either in viscosity or in Sobolev sense (after regularization) under suitable assumptions and with implications with regards to the optimality of strategies.

keywords: stochastic control; mean-variance control; Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation; Sobolev solutions; viscosity solutions.

---

[*] **ams classification:** 93E20, 60H10.

[†] University of Leeds, School of Mathematics, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK, e-mail: G.Aivaliotis@leeds.ac.uk

[‡] University of Leeds, School of Mathematics, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK, e-mail: a.veretennikov@leeds.ac.uk & University of Leeds, UK & National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia & Institute of Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russia

1 Introduction

Mean-variance optimisation problems have been established as a dominant methodology for portfolio optimisation. Markowitz [10] introduced the single-period formulation of the problem in 1952. It was not until the beginning of the new century, however, that dynamic mean-variance optimisation by means of dynamic programming received much attention, mainly due to the difficulties that the non-markovianity of the variance introduced to the problem. As an alternative to dynamic programming, the problem was solved using martingale methods (see, e.g., Bielecki et al. [4]) or risk-sensitive functionals (see, e.g., Bielecki et al. [5]), whose second order Taylor expansion has the form of a mean-variance functional.

A major advance in the theory for mean-variance functionals came by embedding the original problem into a class of auxiliary stochastic control problems that are in Linear-Quadratic form. This approach was introduced by Li and Ng [8] in a discrete-time setting, while an extension of this method to a continuous-time framework is presented in Zhou and Li [14], and further employed Lim [9]. This approach leads to explicit solutions for the efficient frontier under some constraints imposed the optimisation problem (they assume that the cost function is a linear function of the controlled proccess). Wang and Forsyth [13] design numerical schemes for auxiliary linear-quadratic problems formulated in [14] and construct an efficient frontier. In [12], Tse et al. show that the numerical schemes designed in [13] provide indeed all the Pareto-optimal points for the efficient frontier.

Aivaliotis and Veretennikov [1] propose an alternative methodology that embeds the mean-variance problem into a superposition of a static and a dynamic optimisation problem, where the latter is suitable for dynamic programming methods. Solutions in the spaces of functions with generalised derivatives (henceforth called Sobolev spaces) are obtained through reqularisation. A further extension of this method is presented in [2] where the viscosity solutions approach is followed. In the latter, each of the functionals either depending on the terminal value of the controlled process or on the integral from time 0 to time T of the controlled process are considered but separately. This approach does not in general provide any explicit solutions, but is geared towards numerical approximations that are proven to work efficiently. One advantage of the proposed methodology is that the problem can be solved for a pre-determined coefficient of risk aversion. For the LQ approach, the whole efficient frontier has to be traced and then optimal strategies can be assigned to different coefficients of risk-aversion.

Let us consider a d-dimensional SDE driven by a d-dimensional Wiener process $(W_t, \mathcal{F}_t,\ t \geq 0)$

$$dX_t = b(\alpha_t, t, X_t)\,dt + \sigma(\alpha_t, t, X_t)\,dW_t, \quad t \geq t_0, \qquad X_{t_0} = x. \tag{1}$$

We will specify the properties of the coefficients b and σ later, depending on the approach we use. The strategy $(\alpha_t,\ t_0 \leq t \leq T)$ may be chosen from the class $\mathcal{A}$ of all progressive measurable processes with values in $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ such that $A \neq \emptyset$, bounded and closed. We will use the standard short notation where the dependence of X on the strategy, initial data x and t_0 is shown by $E^\alpha_{t_0,x}$ with respect to expectation; the full notation would be $X_t^{\alpha,t_0,x}$.

Consider a cost function $f : \mathbb{R}^\ell \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. The cost from time t_0 to T for a certain path of a process (1) and strategy $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ will be $\int_{t_0}^T f(\alpha_s, s, X_s^{\alpha,t_0,x})\,ds$. At the terminal time T, we will consider a "final payment" $\Phi(X_T)$. Thus the expected cost from t_0 to T for a control strategy $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ will be

$$E^\alpha_{t_0,x}\left(\int_{t_0}^T f(\alpha_s, s, X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\right).$$

In financial applications the standard terminology of "cost" has often a positive meaning, representing some function of portfolio returns or cashflows. Thus in the mean-variance control problem, one aims at maximising the expected cost while penalizing for variance (that represents risk).The value function in this case will be

$$\begin{aligned} v(t_0,x) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \Bigg\{ & E^\alpha_{t_0,x}\left(\int_{t_0}^T f(\alpha_s, s, X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\right) \\ & -\theta \ \mathrm{Var}^\alpha_{t_0,x}\left(\int_{t_0}^T f(\alpha_s, s, X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\right)\Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In this paper we are going to consider solutions of this problem both in Sobolev spaces and in Viscosity sense and discuss the optimal strategies. The contribution of this paper is threefold: we consider a general integral and terminal time payment functional, we relax the assumptions on boundedness of the coefficients and cost functions and we discuss the optimality of strategies in different settings.

With regards to the functional, the problem without a"final payment" Φ has been discussed in [1] with solutions in Sobolev spaces and the problems with either only integral functional or only "final payment" were discussed in [2] using Viscosity solutions. It is clear, however, that the solution to problem (2) cannot be derived as a combination of the previous two cases due to the supremum involved.

When looking for solutions in Sobolev spaces, we need to use regularisation (similar to [1]) as we cannot relax the non-degeneracy assumption (which is not needed for Viscosity solutions). We do however relax the assumptions regarding the boundness of the drift and diffusion coefficients as well as of the cost function f in comparison to the assumptions used in [1]. Finally we show that regularisation results into $\varepsilon-$optimal strategies, whereas a verification theorem for Viscosity solutions is only attainable under strict boundness assumptions, which are not fulfilled in our context.

2 Mean-Variance Control

The goal of this paper is to maximize a linear combination of the mean and variance of a payoff function that involves both an integral and a final payment. The value function (2) presents a non-markovian optimisation problem. This is due to the time-inconsistency of the variance term due to the square of the expectation and the square of an integral of the process. In detail

$$\begin{aligned} v(t_0,x) := \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \Bigg\{ & E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x}\Big(\int_{t_0}^{T} f(\alpha_s,s,X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\Big) \\ & - \theta\,\Big[E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x}\big(\int_{t_0}^{T} f(\alpha_s,s,X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\big)^2 \\ & - \Big(E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x}\big(\int_{t_0}^{T} f(\alpha_s,s,X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\big)\Big)^2 \Big] \Bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to deal with the square of the integral, we define the following state process (X_t, Y_t) by the following stochastic differential equation (as in Aivaliotis and Veretennikov [1] or Aivaliotis and Palczewski [2]):

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= b(\alpha_t,t,X_t)\,dt + \sigma(\alpha_t,t,X_t)\,dW_t, \quad X_0 = x \\ dY_t &= f(\alpha_t,t,X_t)\,dt, \quad Y_0 = y. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We will endeavor for existence and uniqueness of solutions to the above SDE. The different sets of assumptions, depending on the approach we follow, will result in different types of solutions of the above SDE. We will comment on these in the relevant sections. Note that f drives the dynamics of Y_t in the extended state process (X_t, Y_t), therefore we will need to impose the same assumptions we impose on b.

Naturally, we allow the process Y_t to depend on some initial data $Y_{t_0} = y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the value function can be written as $v(t_0, x) := \tilde{v}(t_0, x, 0)$, where

$$\tilde{v}(t_0, x, y) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \Bigg\{ E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big(g^{\alpha}(X_T, Y_T) \\ - \theta \left[E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \big(g^{\alpha}(X_T, Y_T) \big)^2 - \Big(E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \big(g^{\alpha}(X_T, Y_T) \big) \Big)^2 \right] \Bigg\}$$

and

$$g^{\alpha}(X_T, Y_T) := g(X_T, Y_T, \alpha(\cdot)) = \int_{t_0}^{T} f(\alpha_s, s, X_s)\, ds + \Phi(X_T) = Y_T + \Phi(X_T).$$

From now on the dependence of g on the control will also be incorporated in the expectation in order to simplify notation.

For the square of the expectation, we follow the dual representation $x^2 = \sup_{\psi \in \mathbb{R}} \{-\psi^2 - 2\psi x\}$ (as in Aivaliotis and Veretennikov [1]). This results to the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}(t_0, x, y) &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \Bigg\{ E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} g(X_T, Y_T) - \theta\, E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \big(g(X_T, Y_T) \big)^2 \\ &\qquad - \sup_{\psi \in \mathbb{R}} \Big\{ -\theta\psi^2 - 2\theta\psi E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} g(X_T, Y_T) \Big\} \Bigg\} \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in \mathbb{R}} \Big\{ V(t_0, x, y, \psi) - \theta\psi^2 \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V(t_0, x, y, \psi) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big((1 - 2\theta\psi) g(X_T, Y_T) - \theta \big(g(X_T, Y_T) \big)^2 \Big)$.

REMARK 2.1. *Note that a similar representation is available for any convex function in place of a parabola, although the implementation of this idea may be more involved. In the case of an even power function x^{2n}, however, such a representation has the same level of "complexity" as for x^2:*

$$x^{2n} = \sup_{\psi \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\psi^{2n} + 2n\psi^{2n-1}(x - \psi) \right).$$

This may be helpful in studying optimization of a wider family of functionals.

3 Viscosity Solutions

In this section we make the following assumptions:

(A$_V$)

- The functions σ, b, f, Φ are Borel with respect to (a,t,x) and continuous with respect to (a,x) for every t; moreover, there exist constants K_1, K_2 such that
$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(a,t_1,x)-\sigma(a,t_2,z)\| &\le K_1\left(\|x-z\|+|t_1-t_2|\right) \\ \|b(a,t_1,x)-b(a,t_2,z)\| &\le K_1\left(\|x-z\|+|t_1-t_2|\right) \qquad \text{(Lipschitz condition)} \\ |f(a,t_1,x)-f(a,t_2,z)| &\le K_2\left(\|x-z\|+|t_1-t_2|\right) \end{aligned}$$
- $$\begin{aligned} \|b(a,t,x)\| &\le K_1\big(1+\|x\|\big) \\ \|\sigma(a,t,x)\| &\le K_1\big(1+\|x\|\big) \qquad \text{(linear growth condition)} \\ |f(a,t,x)| &\le K_2\big(1+\|x\|\big) \end{aligned}$$
- $|\Phi(x)| \le K_1(1+\|x\|^m)$.

For Viscosity solutions we do not need to assume non-degeneracy of matrix $\sigma\sigma^T$. Note that the process (X_t, Y_t) would have been strongly degenerate even if we had assumed non-degeneracy of $\sigma\sigma^T$.

THEOREM 3.1. *Under assumptions (A$_V$) for every $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ the value function $V(t_0,x,y)$ is a unique polynomially growing Viscosity solution of the following HJB equation:*

$$\begin{cases} V_{t_0} + \sup_{a\in A}\left\{ b(a,t_0,x)^T V_x + \frac{1}{2} tr\big(\sigma\sigma^T(a,t_0,x)V_{xx}\big) + f(u,t_0,x)V_y \right\} = 0, \\ V(T,x,y,\psi) = (1-2\theta\psi)g(x,y) - \theta\big(g(x,y)\big)^2, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Proof. We rewrite (4) in a canonical form:

$$\begin{cases} -V_{t_0}(t_0,\tilde{x},\psi) - H\Big(t_0,\tilde{x},V_{\tilde{x}}(t_0,\tilde{x},\psi),V_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}}(t_0,\tilde{x}),\psi\Big) = 0, \\ V(T,\tilde{x},\psi) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{x} = (x,y)$, the Hamiltonian H is given by

$$H\Big(t,(x,y),\tilde{p},\tilde{M}\Big) = \sup_{u\in A}\Big[b(u,t,x)^T p + \frac{1}{2} tr\big(\sigma\sigma^T(u,t,x)M\big) + p_y f(u,t,x)\Big],$$

with $\tilde{p} = (p, p_y)$ and M is obtained from $\tilde{M}$ by removing the last row and column. Assumptions (A$_V$) imply that the domain of the Hamiltonian is the whole space ($dom(H) = \{(t, x, p, M) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^n\}$) and H is continuous. By virtue of [11, Theorem 4.3.1], V is a viscosity solution of (4) (it is clearly of polynomial growth because of the assumptions on the growth of f and Φ). Due to the Lipschitz continuity in t, x of f, b and σ the value function V is continuous at the terminal time $t = T$. Hence, the comparison theorem ([11, Theorem 4.4.5]) yields the continuity of V and assures that V is a unique continuous polynomially growing viscosity solution to (4). $\square$

4 Sobolev Solutions

In this section we suggest suitable HJB equations for the suggested mean-variance problem, as reformulated in the previous section. The solutions of parabolic HJBs will be considered in the Sobolev classes $W^{1,2}_{p,loc}$ with one derivative with respect to t and two with respect to x in L_p. Denote $\overline{W}^{1,2} = \bigcap_{p>1} W^{1,2}_p$. For the functions of three variables, $v(t, x, y),\ 0 \le t \le T,\ x, y \in R^d,$ we will use a similar Sobolev class $\overline{W}^{1,2,2} = \bigcap_{p>1} W^{1,2,2}_p$.

Throughout this section, we assume the following

A$_S$

- The functions σ, b, f are Borel with respect to (u, t, x), continuous with respect to (u, x) and continuous with respect to x uniformly over u for each t. $\Phi(x)$ is continuous with respect to x. Moreover,
- $$\begin{aligned} &\|\sigma(u,t,x) - \sigma(u,t,x')\| \le K_1|x - x'| \\ &\|b(u,t,x) - b(u,t,x')\| \le K_1|x - x'| \qquad \text{(Lipschitz condition)} \\ &|f(u,t,x) - f(u,t,x')| \le K_2|x - x'| \end{aligned}$$
- $$\begin{aligned} &\|\sigma(u,t,x)\| + \|b(u,t,x)\| \le K(1 + \|x\|) \qquad \text{(linear growth condition)} \\ &|f(u,t,x)| \le K_2(1 + \|x\|) \end{aligned}$$
- $|\Phi(x)| \le K_2(1 + \|x\|^m)$.
- $\sigma\sigma^T$ is uniformly non-degenerate,

In order to establish the existence of solutions in Sobolev spaces, it is essential that the resulting HJB equations are non-degenerate. However, it is clear that the state process (3) is strongly degenerate and so will be the resulting HJB equation for problem (4). In order to avoid degeneracy, apart from assuming non-degeneracy for $\sigma\sigma^T$ we add a small constant positive diffusion coefficient with an independent (to W_t) Wiener process to the SDE for Y_t in (3). The regularised state process becomes:

$$dX_t = b(\alpha_t, t, X_t)\,dt + \sigma(\alpha_t, t, X_t)\,dW_t, \tag{5}$$

$$dY_t^\varepsilon = f(\alpha_t, t, X_t)\,dt + \varepsilon\tilde{W}_{t-t_0}. \tag{6}$$

Accordingly we define the regularized value function:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{v}^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y) &= \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\Bigg\{E^\alpha_{t_0,x,y}g(X_T, Y_T^\varepsilon) - \theta\, E^\alpha_{t_0,x,y}\big(g(X_T, Y_T^\varepsilon)\big)^2 \\ &\qquad + \sup_{\psi\in\mathbb{R}}\Big\{-\theta\psi^2 - 2\theta\psi E^\alpha_{t_0,x,y}g(X_T, Y_T^\varepsilon)\Big\}\Bigg\} \\ &= \sup_{\psi\in\mathbb{R}}\Big\{V^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y, \psi) - \theta\psi^2\Big\},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$V^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y, \psi) = \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} E^\alpha_{t_0,x,y}\Big((1-2\theta\psi)g(X_T, Y_T^\varepsilon) - \theta\big(g(X_T, Y_T^\varepsilon)\big)^2\Big).$$

THEOREM 4.1. *Under assumptions (A$_S$) for every $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ the value function $V^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y)$ is a unique solution in $\overline{W}^{1,2,2}$ of the following HJB equation:*

$$\begin{cases} V^\varepsilon_{t_0} + \sup_{u\in A}\Big\{b(u, t_0, x)^T V^\varepsilon_x + \frac{1}{2}tr\big(\sigma\sigma^T(u, t_0, x)V^\varepsilon_{xx}\big) + f(u, t, x)V^\varepsilon_y + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon V^\varepsilon_{yy}\Big\} = 0, \\ V^\varepsilon(T, x, y, \psi) = (1-2\theta\psi)g(x, y) - \theta\big(g(x, y)\big)^2. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Proof. Under Assumptions (A$_S$) the value function has first and second order bounded generalised derivatives with respect to space and first order bounded generalised derivative with respect to time. The rest follows from [7, Chapter 3 and 4]. □

In the next section, we will show that the function $V^{2,\varepsilon}$ is locally Lipschitz in ψ and grows at most linearly in this variable. Hence, the supremum is again attained at some ψ from a closed interval. Then the external optimisation problem becomes:

$$v^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x, y) = \sup_{\psi} \left[V^{2,\varepsilon}(t_0, x, y, \psi) - \theta\psi^2 \right]. \tag{8}$$

5 Properties of value functions

In this sections we show some properties of the value functions that are common in both approaches described above. These are important properties that allow the numerical solution of the mean-variance problem to be tractable. We assume that a new set of assumptions (A_0) holds, which is the intersection of the assumptions (A_S) and (A_V).

THEOREM 5.1. *Under Assumptions (A_0):*

i) The functions V, V^{ε}, ($V^{(\varepsilon)}$ in short) are continuous in ψ and convex in ψ. If f, Φ are non-negative, V, V^{ε} are decreasing in ψ.

ii) There exists a constant C such that

$$|V^{(\varepsilon)}(t_0, x, y, \psi) - V^{(\varepsilon)}(t_0, x, y, \psi')| \le C\,(1 + \|x\|)\,|\psi - \psi'|.$$

iii) The value function v is given by

$$v(t_0, x) = \sup_{\psi_{min} \le \psi \le \psi_{max}} \left\{ V^{(\varepsilon)}(t_0, x, 0, \psi) - \theta\psi^2 \right\},$$

where

$$\psi_{min} = -\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} g(t, X_t, Y_t)$$

and

$$\psi_{max} = -\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} g(t, X_t, Y_t)$$

Proof. The Proof follows the same line of reasoning as in [2][Theorem 2.2] and making use of the definition for the function g. For part (i), it is straightforward to prove convexity, which implies continuity with respect to ψ. It is clear from the definition of V, V^{ε} that they are decreasing in ψ for non-negative f, Φ. For part (ii) we check that V^{ε} grows at most linearly, which implies that the mapping

$h(\psi) = V^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y, \psi) - \theta\psi^2$ attains its maximum in a compact interval. By convexity, V^ε has well-defined directional derivatives. Hence, h also has well-defined directional derivatives and in a point where the maximum is attained the left-hand side derivative is non-negative while the right-hand side derivative is non-positive. We then show that $\partial^+ h(\psi) > 0$ for $\psi < \psi_{min}$ and $\partial^- h(\psi) < 0$ for $\psi > \psi_{max}$. This implies that the conditions for maximum can only be satisfied in the interval $[\psi_{min}, \psi_{max}]$. We skip further details and refer the reader to [2][Theorem 2.2].

□

THEOREM 5.2. *Under assumptions (A_0):*

$$\sup_{t,x,y} |v^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y) - v(t_0, x, y)| \le \varepsilon^2 \theta (T - t_0). \tag{9}$$

Proof. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
|v^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y) - v(t_0, x, y)| &\le \sup_{\psi} |\big(V^\varepsilon(t_0, x, y, \psi) - \theta\psi^2 - V(t_0, x, y, \psi) + \theta\psi^2\big)| \\
&= \sup_{\psi} |\Big\{ \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T)[1 - 2\theta\psi] - \theta\big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T)\big)^2 \Big) \\
&- \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big(g(X_T, Y_T)[1 - 2\theta\psi] - \theta\big(g(X_T, Y_T)\big)^2 \Big) \Big\}| \\
&\le \sup_{\psi} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big\{ \big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T) - g(X_T, Y_T) \big) [1 - 2\theta\psi] \\
&- \theta \Big(\big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T)\big)^2 - \big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T)\big)^2 \Big) \Big\}| \\
&= \sup_{\psi} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big\{ [1 - 2\theta\psi] \int_{t_0}^{T} \varepsilon \, d\tilde{W}_t \\
&- \theta \big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T) - g(X_T, Y_T) \big) \big(g(X_T, Y^\varepsilon_T) + g(X_T, Y_T) \big) \Big\}| \\
&= \sup_{\psi} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x,y} \Big\{ [1 - 2\theta\psi] \int_{t_0}^{T} \varepsilon \, d\tilde{W}_t \\
&- \theta \Bigg(2 \int_{t_0}^{T} \varepsilon \, d\tilde{W}_t \int_{t_0}^{T} f(t, X_t) \, dt \\
&+ \Big(\int_{t_0}^{T} \varepsilon \, d\tilde{W}_t \Big)^2 + 2\Phi(X_T) \int_{t_0}^{T} \varepsilon \, d\tilde{W}_t \Bigg) \Big\}| \\
&\le \varepsilon^2 \theta (T - t_0),
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

since the brownian motion $\tilde{W}_t$ is independent of X_t. This concludes the proof. $\square$

6 Optimal Strategies

6.1 Sobolev approach

When we work with solutions of HJB equations in Sobolev spaces, then there is an automatic verification theorem that ensures the optimality of the strategy that corresponds to the particular solution. This convenient property is mainly due to the availability of some kind of Itô formula (in this case Itô-Krylov formula). Since, however the problem solved is regularised, we can only hope for "almost-optimal" strategies for the original problem.

DEFINITION 6.1. *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. A strategy $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be $\epsilon-$optimal for (t,x) if $v(t,x) \leq v^{\alpha}(t,x) + \epsilon$, where $v(t,x) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t,x)$.*

LEMMA 6.2. *Under assumptions (A_0), for any strategy $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we have the following bounds*

$$|v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y)| \leq C\,\varepsilon^2. \tag{11}$$

with $C = \theta(T - t_0)$.

Proof. One can show similarly to Theorem 5.2 that

$$|v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y)| \leq \varepsilon^2 \theta(T - t_0),$$

therefore

$$v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2. \tag{12}$$

$\square$

THEOREM 6.3. *Assume (A_0). Let the strategy $\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{A}$ be the optimal strategy for the problem (8), or if the supremum is not attained, let the strategy $\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{A}$ be a $\delta-$optimal strategy for the same problem . Then, the same strategy is ϵ-optimal for the original degenerate value function with appropriate choice of the constant ϵ.*

Proof. Suppose that the value function of the degenerate problem attains its supremum for a strategy $\bar{\alpha}$. Then, we would have from Lemma 6.2

$$v^{\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2. \tag{13}$$

Furthermore, because the strategy $\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$ is optimal for the regularised value function (assuming that the supremum is attained), we know that

$$v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \geq v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y). \tag{14}$$

So,

$$v^{\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2. \tag{15}$$

Hence

$$v^{\bar{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - 2C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y), \tag{16}$$

i.e. $\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$ is $2C\varepsilon^2-$optimal for v^{α} or $\epsilon = 2C\varepsilon^2$ in this case.

In the case that the degenerate value function does not attain a supremum, a $\gamma-$optimal strategy exists, namely $\tilde{\alpha}$. Then

$$v^{\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) \geq \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - \gamma \tag{17}$$

and due to the bounds (11) and inequality (17) we have

$$\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - \gamma - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2. \tag{18}$$

Now, suppose again that $v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) = \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y)$. That means $v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \geq v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y)$.

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - \gamma - C\varepsilon^2 &\leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) \\ &\leq v^{\varepsilon,\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2.\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) + \gamma + 2C\varepsilon^2, \tag{20}$$

i.e. $\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$ is an $(\gamma + 2C\varepsilon^2)-$optimal strategy for $v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y)$ or $\epsilon = \gamma + 2C\varepsilon^2$ in this case.

Finally, in the case that $\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y)$ is not attained, a $\delta-$optimal strategy $\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$ is attained instead, such that $v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \leq \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\varepsilon,\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - \delta$. Following the same reasoning as previously (note that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is $\gamma-$optimal for v^{ε}), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) - \gamma - \delta - C\varepsilon^2 \leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - C\varepsilon^2 - \delta \\ &\leq v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}}(t_0,x,y) - \delta \leq v^{\varepsilon,\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) + C\varepsilon^2.\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y) \leq v^{\tilde{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}}(t_0,x,y) + \gamma + \delta + 2C\varepsilon^2, \tag{22}$$

i.e. $\bar{\alpha}^{\varepsilon}$ is an $(\gamma + \delta + 2C\varepsilon^2)-$optimal strategy for $v^{\alpha}(t_0,x,y)$ or $\epsilon = \gamma + \delta + 2C\varepsilon^2$. □

COROLLARY 6.4. *Let assumptions (A_0) hold. The supremum attained for the degenerate value function by using Markov strategies is almost the same as the one attained in the class of admissible strategies. So Markov strategies are $\epsilon-$ optimal for the degenerate value function.*

Proof. Since we deal everywhere with "first moment theory" and additionally an optimal $\bar{\psi}$ can always be found in a real interval, we know that Markov strategies are sufficient for the problem (see [7]). Therefore, because of the previous Theorem, Markov strategies are sufficient in obtaining an $\epsilon-$optimal strategy for the degenerate value function. □

6.2 Viscosity Approach

When working with viscosity solutions, there is no verification theorem that can be applied under the assumptions made in this paper (see Gozzi et al. [6] for the latest results on the verification theorem for viscosity solutions). One possible approach is to verify the optimality of the strategies using Monte Carlo simulations using the strategy calculated from the solution of the HJB equation and compare the value of the value function obtained by simulation to the one from the numerical scheme.

7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we formulated a general mean-variance problem in continuous time that includes a functional with two terms: an integral that depends on the whole trajectory of the controlled process and a terminal time one. We interpreted the problem first as a terminal time problem, through the introduction of a coupled state process with an additional dimension and then transformed it into a superposition of a static and a dynamic optimization problem, where the latter is feasible for dynamic programming methods and for which we were able to write down an HJB equation. We proved existence and uniqueness of solutions both in viscosity sense and also in classical (Sobolev) sense. The advantage of the first approach is that there is no need to address the inherent degeneracy of the coupled state process, whereas numerical solutions can be employed to solve the problem and to even show optimality thought Monte Carlo simulations; however, in this approach a verification theorem is not readily applicable under the assumptions we use.

When following the Sobolev approach, a regularisation of the state process is required. This has the advantage that a verification theorem can be obtained through Itô-Krylov's formula. We then showed that strategies obtained through this route are $\varepsilon-$optimal.

Finally recall that using the hint shown in the Remark 2.1, the results in both sections 3 and 4 allow extentions to the case of functionals that involve even power functions like $\Big(E^{\alpha}_{t_0,x}\big(\int_{t_0}^{T} f(\alpha_s, s, X_s)\,ds + \Phi(X_T)\big)\Big)^{2n}$.

References

[1] Aivaliotis, G. and Veretennikov, A. Yu., 2010 *On Bellman's equations for mean and variance control of a Markov diffusion*. Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 82: 1, 41 ï£¡ 51.

[2] Aivaliotis, G., Palczewski, J., 2014. *Investment strategies and compensation of a mean-variance optimizing fund manager*. European Journal of Operational Research, 234:2, 561-570.

[3] Aivaliotis, G., Palczewski, J., 2010. *Tutorial for viscosity solutions in optimal control of diffusions*. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1582548.

[4] Bielecki, T., Jin, H., Pliska, S.R., Zhou, X.Y., 2005. *Continuous-Time Mean-Variance Portfolio Selection with Bankruptcy Prohibition*. Mathematical Finance 15, 213-244.

[5] Bielecki, T., Pliska, S.R., Sherris, M., 2000. *Risk Sensitive Asset Allocation*. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 24, 1145-1177.

[6] Gozzi, F., Świech, A., Zhou, X.Y., 2009. *Erratum: "A corrected proof of the stochastic verification theorem within the framework of viscosity solutions"*. SIAM Journal on Control Optimization 48:6, 4177-4179.

[7] Krylov, N. V., 1980. *Controlled Diffusion Processes*, Springer-Verlag.

[8] Li, D., Ng, W.-L., 2000. *Optimal Dynamic Portfolio Selection: Multiperiod Mean-Variance Formulation*. Mathematical Finance 10:3, 387-406.

[9] Lim, A.E.B., 2004. *Quadratic hedging and mean-variance portfolio selection in an incomplete market*. Mathematics of Operations Research 29, 132-161.

[10] Markowitz, H. M., 1952. *Portfolio Selection*. Journal of Finance 7:1 , 77-91.

[11] Pham, H., 2009. Continuous-time Stochastic Control and Optimization with Financial Applications. Springer.

[12] Tse, S., T., Forsyth, P., A., Li, Y., 2014. Preservation of Scalarization Optimal Points in the Embedding Technique for Continuous Time Mean-Variance Optimization. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 52:3, 1527ï£¡1546.

[13] Wang, J., Forsyth, P.A., 2010. Numerical solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman formulation for continuous time mean variance asset allocation. Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control 34, 207-230.

[14] Zhou, X. Y. and Li, D., 2000. *Continuous-Time Mean-Variance Portfolio Selection: A Stochastic LQ Framework*. Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 42, 19-33.

Acknowledgments:
For the second author the paper was prepared within the framework of a subsidy granted to the HSE by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program.